

APPENDIX A

Summary of Scoping Comments

BLM received a total of 95 comments. 86 comments said they supported the proposed action to withdraw project lands from future oil and gas leasing. Scoping issues raised are noted here.

| Commenter | Issues noted | If no issues, what was noted. |
|--|--|--|
| Wyoming Governor Matt Mead | In Gov. Mead's Dec. 2012 letter he asked for the BLM to evaluate removing (project area lands) split estate lands as unavailable for oil and gas leasing. Governor also asked that "the BLM evaluate designating federal mineral estate available, with no surface occupancy for the same area. | |
| The Greater Yellowstone Coalition | | Representing 40,000 members, support making the project area acreage unavailable for future minerals leasing and development. |
| Wy. Game and Fish Dept. | | Support making the project area acreage unavailable for future minerals leasing and development. |
| Wyoming Outdoor Council | | Support making the project area acreage unavailable for future minerals leasing and development. |
| Sublette County Conservation Dist. | | Supports RMP amendment proposal. Consider implications of permanent withdrawal on private property rights of landowners affected. |
| Linda Cooper on behalf of, Stop Drilling-Save the Bridger-Teton. | Protect the area for other resource use: wildlife, recreation, conservation. Removal of oil and gas leasing will help prevent fires. | Clarify the NOI map provided to more clearly show the EA project area with the RMP and USFS boundaries and other map labels. |
| David Steyaert | | Concerned wealthy individuals with an environmental agenda are taking lands with resources out of the leasing pool. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | The wealthy, or groups, now own the minerals and only they will be able to benefit from these minerals. |
| Teddy Roosevelt Conservation Partnership | | Support removing the areas from future leasing; finishing the work of the Trust for public land. |
| James Ferguson Fishing Guide | Notes development on these lands would have a negative impact on the ecosystem. | Supports removing the lands from future minerals leasing. |
| Jeff and Diana Jung | No leasing provides open space, clean air and wildlife habitat. Deer and antelope need winter range. | Support removing the lands from future leasing consideration. |
| Nick Dobric | | Supports removal of lands from future leasing. Asks PFO to consider other lands for removal from future minerals leasing. |
| Jean Public, NJ | | Comments are outside the EA scope. |
| Wildlife Conservation Society, WCS | <p>Supports removing project lands from future minerals leasing.</p> <p>1.WCS notes that if the project area is available for minerals leasing in the future, pronghorn will avoid the area, if it is developed. It would also increase pronghorn vulnerability.</p> <p>2. Migrating pronghorn avoid developed areas.</p> <p>3. “An unmitigated migration impediment could eventually extirpate migration routes, including those found in the RMP Amendment Area.”</p> <p>7 maps were shared which showed the pronghorn use of lands in the RMP project area and environs.</p> | |
| 82 commenters | | All say that they support the removal of project lands from future minerals leasing consideration. |